

REMARKS

The drawings are objected to. New sheets of the drawings are filed herewith. The Abstract is objected to. The Abstract is amended.

Claims 11-28 are pending in the application. Claims 11-28 are rejected. Claims 11 to 13 and 24 to 27 are amended. Claim 24 is amended to provide a clearer antecedent basis for the recitals in claim 24. Claims 25 and 26 are amended to correct an obvious error in their dependencies.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 11-12, 15, 17-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feldman (Patent No. US 6,393,000 B1) in view of Wang (Patent Number: US 7,146,314 B2). Claims 13, 26 - 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined system (Feldman '000 - Wang '314) in view of Chauffour et al. (Patent Number: 5,870,397). Claims 14, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined system (Feldman '000 - Wang '314) in view of Wajda et al. (Patent No.: US 6,711,584 B1).

It is submitted that the combination of Feldman '000 and Wang '314 would not teach each and every feature recited in the claims on file.

Any combination of Feldman '000 and Wang '314 would not teach each and every feature recited in the claims on file

Neither Feldman '000 nor Wang '314 discloses features corresponding to:

“communication of conversational data signals between terminals over a radio link capable of full-duplex transmission of conversational data packets in alternate directions within a pair of time slots, said communication comprising time periods each comprising a set of said pairs of time slots”, “detecting local conversational activity at each of said terminals respectively, sending conversational activity signals indicative of the local conversational activity condition from each of said terminals to the other terminal”, “controlling said reception and transmission modules to communicate by half-duplex transmission of said conversational data packets in response to conversational activity at a first one of said terminals but not at the second one of said terminals” and

“at least partially deactivating said reception module at said first terminal and said transmission module at said second terminal during said half-duplex transmission” as recited in claim 11.

More specifically, neither Feldman '000 nor Wang '314 discloses the following features of claim 11:

1. transmission of packets in alternate directions within a set of pairs of time slots
2. sending conversational activity signals from each of the terminals to the other
3. controlling reception and transmission modules to communicate by half-duplex transmission of conversational data packets in response to conversational activity at a first one of said terminals but not at the second one of said terminals
4. deactivating a reception module at said first terminal and a transmission module at said second terminal.

Feldman '000 does not teach the following features recited in the claims on file:

1. In Feldman '000, there is no disclosure of transmission of packets in alternate directions within a set of pairs of time slots, as recited in present claim 11: all the examples of transmission links involve transmission channels which do not alternate.
2. In Feldman '000, there is no disclosure of sending conversational activity signals from each of the terminals to the other, as recited in present claim 11: in Feldman '000, the MES 6 and 8 do not send conversational activity signals (such as SID signals) indicative of the local conversational activity condition.
3. In Feldman '000, there is no disclosure of controlling reception and transmission modules to communicate by half-duplex transmission of conversational data packets in response to conversational activity at a first one of said terminals but not at the second one of said terminals, as recited in present claim 11: either the transmissions are full-duplex or they are half-duplex but there is no disclosure of switching between half-duplex and full-duplex, let alone taking account of conversational activity in controlling which is selected.
4. In Feldman '000, there is no disclosure of deactivating a reception module at said first terminal (the terminal where there is conversation activity and which does not receive conversational data packets from the other terminal) and a transmission module at said second terminal (the terminal where there is no conversation activity and which

receives conversational data packets from the other terminal) as recited in present claim 11. In Feldman '000, the first terminal LES 4 sends data instead of voice if there is no local conversation activity, and transmits signaling data, such as a calling code which includes a service-type code, and an address code (col. 3 lines 34-49) the transmissions never being deactivated. The receiver at each station remains active to receive the data packets and the signaling data, which are received by both MES 6 and MES 8, MES 6 "ignoring the rest of the data packet" its reception not being deactivated (col.4 lines 34-44).

Wang '314 does not teach the following features recited in the claims on file:

1. In Wang '314, there is no disclosure of transmission of packets in alternate directions within a set of pairs of time slots, as recited in present claim 11: in Wang '314, when voice activity is detected at a terminal, it transmits, otherwise it does not, but there is no transmission of packets in alternate directions within a set of pairs of time slots.
2. In Wang '314, there is no disclosure of sending conversational activity signals indicative of the local conversational activity condition from each of said terminals to the other terminal, as recited in present claim 11: in Wang '314, either voice signals are transmitted when local voice activity is detected or no voice signals are transmitted, but there is no disclosure of sending conversational activity signals indicative of the local conversational activity to the other terminal.
3. In Wang '314, there is no disclosure of controlling reception and transmission modules to communicate by half-duplex transmission of said conversational data packets in response to conversational activity at a first one of said terminals but not at the second one of said terminals, as recited in present claim 11: in Wang '314, transmission is always either half-duplex or full-duplex but there is no disclosure of switching between half-duplex and full-duplex, let alone taking account of conversational activity at either terminal in selecting half-duplex or full-duplex, and clearly no account is taken of conversational activity at the remote terminal since no conversational activity signals are received from the remote terminal.
4. In Wang '314, there is no disclosure of deactivating a reception module at said first terminal (the terminal where there is conversation activity and which does not receive conversational data packets from the other terminal) and a transmission module at said

second terminal (the terminal where there is no conversation activity and which receives conversational data packets from the other terminal) as recited in present claim 11: in Wang '314, the receivers are not deactivated even when the other terminal's transmission is deactivated and, in fact, the receivers of Wang '314 cannot be deactivated in that way since no conversational activity signals are received from the remote terminal to indicate presence or absence of transmission.

Thus, the combination of Feldman '000 and Wang '314 does not teach each and every feature cited in the claims on file. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the subject matter of those claims was not obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 11 is novel and non-obvious in view of the prior art cited and is allowable. Claims 11 to 23, 27 and 28 depend from claim 11 and include all the limitations of claim 11 and are submitted to be allowable at least for this reason. Claim 24 includes recitals similar to claim 11 and it is submitted that claim 24 is novel and non-obvious in view of the prior art cited for similar reasons and is allowable. Claims 25 and 26 depend from claim 24 and include all the limitations of claim 24 and are submitted to be allowable at least for this reason.

Although Applicant may disagree with statements made by the Examiner in reference to the claims and the cited references, Applicant is not discussing all these statements in the current Office Action since reasons for the patentability of each pending claim are provided without addressing these statements. Therefore, Applicant reserves the right to address these statements at a later time if necessary.

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

If Applicant has overlooked any additional fees, or if any overpayment has been made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit or debit Deposit Account 503079, Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

By: /David G. Dolezal/

Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 41,711
Telephone: (512) 996-6839
Fax No.: (512) 996-6854